

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**PLAZA PROPERTIES, LLC and
PROPERTY CONSULTANTS, LLC,**

Appellants,

v.

JENKINS DISPLAYS CO., et al.,

Appellees.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 08-CV-313-WDS

ORDER

STIEHL, District Judge:

Before the Court is appellants Plaza Properties, LLC (Plaza Properties) and Property Consultants, LLC (Property Consultants) motion for extension of time (Doc. 3), to which appellee Jenkins has filed an objection (Doc. 6). Also before the Court is appellants' motion to supplement (Doc. 4), to which appellee Jenkins has filed an objection (Doc. 5).

Appellants seek an extension of thirty (30) days to file their brief.¹ Appellee Jenkins objects to an extension of time because appellants' failure to comply with Rule 8009(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure will cause prejudice by delaying the disposition of nearly \$1.5 million, to which appellee Jenkins claims it has priority. Upon review of the record, the Court **FINDS** that the prejudice created by delaying this appeal for thirty days, allowing time for appellants to file their brief, is not so great as to justify denying appellants' request. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** appellants' motion for extension of time (Doc. 3) and **DIRECTS** appellants' to file their brief on or before June 27, 2008.

¹This bankruptcy appeal was docketed on April 28, 2008 and, pursuant to Rule 8009(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, appellant's brief was due as of May 13, 2008.

Appellants also seek leave to designate the record and to file their statement of the issues out of time. Appellee Jenkins objects because appellants' failure to comply with Rule 8009(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure will cause prejudice by delaying the disposition of nearly \$1.5 million, to which appellee Jenkins claims it has priority. Upon review of the record, the Court **FINDS** that the prejudice created by delaying this appeal for thirty days, allowing time for appellants to file their brief, is not so great as to justify denying appellants' request. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** appellants' motion to supplement (Doc. 4).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 11 , 2008.

s/ WILLIAM D. STIEHL
DISTRICT JUDGE